

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT - WI
FILED

2023 FEB -6 P 2:54

U.S. DISTRICT COURT

23-C-0155

Lisa Lynn Jacobson,
1917 S. 71st St,
Milwaukee, WI 53219

Plaintiff

Vs.

Demand for Jury Trial

Noah Pines, Ross and Pines, LLC
5555 Glenridge Connector,
Suite 435
Atlanta, GA 30342

Defendant

Plaintiff is requesting the court award plaintiff, \$11,000,000 for defamation against defendant, Attorney Noah Pines, due to perceived per quod details, that will, Plaintiff believes, entirely justify the requested award of \$11,000,000. The whole of the defamation alleged, is both sides of that same coin, Libel and slander.

Plaintiff alleges defendant, is more probably than not, guilty of both sides of the same coin of defamation, those being libel, for his written words against Plaintiff, as well as spoken words, verifiably untrue and written and spoken in the presence of not only Plaintiff's client, which Plaintiff believes enjoys a superior agency to the accused, and deeply damaging to not only Plaintiff's daily pursuit of life, liberty and happiness, but also that of Plaintiff's client and expectations of said pursuits of life liberty and own pursuit of happiness.

Plaintiff now throws herself and her licensure as well, on the mercy that Plaintiff believes exists for all to secure, from under Lady Justice's sandals in her request for a return to a more proper role than

has been forced on her, and asks for this esteemed court to grant Plaintiff in this case, as well as case number 23-CV-83, which Plaintiff now also requests be joined with this complaint, has also cited the Supremacy clause, Article VI, clause 2, and hereby also cites, to transfer both cases/complaints, to a more appropriate court, a stricter court for judgement of Plaintiff, and defendant, and all named and unnamed parties, who appear to be grossly out of compliance with civil discourse, and ask for a transfer to the Federal Criminal Court in these same geographic, esteemed halls they were submitted, and provide Plaintiff a Federal Grand Jury as a Federal Witness, in Federal Criminal Court, as a just and fair decision for the court to consider.

Plaintiff also alleges, the details of the representations in question, have far reaching potential affects to the Plaintiff, her client, as well as every American, who survived the last administration, a pandemic and an attack on our Sacred Halls of Congress and asks the court to consider the danger now posed squarely at Plaintiff for having to resort to such public reports, and the opining that Plaintiff is about to endure and has already endured due to defendant's perceived threats to our collective survival in this Democratic Experiment, as well as Plaintiff's and client's survival. When Plaintiff refers to Plaintiff, she believes she is also encompassing to her client, who is innocent and shall remain unnamed. This request for a transfer to Federal Criminal Court under Plaintiff's perceived rights under the 5th amendment are not being invoked due to Plaintiff's perceived wrongs, oh no. This 5th amendment request is being used, now, in this vulnerable representation which resembles traveling blind on an unfamiliar road at night, to bring the accused into the proper court, which Plaintiff is not authorized to enter without the full force of the Federal Government.

Plaintiff has already warned and properly informed, she believes, all named and unnamed parties that could or are currently viewed by Plaintiff as also requiring scrutiny by a similar court, have failed all previously issued cease and desist warnings, both public and private, and have chosen what defendant has mistakenly deemed, the road more commonly traveled today.

Plaintiff prides herself on honest, open communication with her clients and has always strived to work for her clients and her companies equally when negotiating contracts including but not limited to, the insurance industry or past industries/agencies, with the least important factor verifiably, being her rewards. Plaintiff has long worked for a company who instilled and operated with a long-held belief we should always do the right thing because, it is the right thing to do. Plaintiff now includes the teachings of fairness both in her current industry and arguably in society of Mr. W. Clement Stone, and claims them still relevant.

Plaintiff alleges, it is more probably than not, that the current state of our commoner resources, including but not limited to tip lines, background-checked titles in their roles, both elected and those not elected, State and Federal Justice Institutions, and most notably, the fourth estate, are failing at an unacceptable rate for the commoner, to provide a more equal American experience, and leaving the commoner with potentially, no help at all, including, but not limited to, alert trusted titles in our government, both state and federal, and the humans they are embodied by, to potential threats that could have far reaching daily direct affects to more commoners than just Plaintiff and her family.

Plaintiff believes strongly that Noah Pines is a highly experienced attorney, very knowledgeable and capable of providing strong, effective and just representation. Plaintiff also alleges that prior, existing, undisclosed agencies, more probably than not, created a situation that Noah Pines chose to address with misrepresentations of Plaintiff's abilities, validity of legal theories, and agency within the agency of said client, defendant Pines, and Plaintiff.

The amount of power that an attorney with such an impressive record spanning multiple decades must grow to feel, supported by the income that also comes from selling that knowledge, both as an individual attorney and as an author must be, in Plaintiff's views, potentially intoxicating to someone not paying attention to their own reflection, during their rise to stardom.

Plaintiff alleges that defendant more likely than not, misinterpreted the proper civil interpretation of numerous agencies, their potential conflicts to himself and thereby Plaintiff's client, and may have caused him to misunderstand his role in the criminal justice system, from Plaintiff's more familiar perch in the parental-like sector of civil contract law.

Plaintiff has a verifiable verbal contract with defendant, not governed by the Statute of Frauds Doctrine, but equally binding, that binds us both to do the right thing because it is the right thing to do in each of our roles and responsibilities to the same human being, client. Plaintiff will prove, Noah Pines more probably than not, satisfied all five elements of an enforceable contract with Plaintiff over the course of the greater part of two years, and refused to acknowledge the consequences of his actions, his standing in a perceived challenge, and his entitlements and powers, in the face of, Plaintiff believes, the civilly established laws, protected and governed by this esteemed court.

Plaintiff believes her agency's chronological precedence, with said client, also precedes the agency with our client and Defendant Pines, in legal hierarchy as well as moral and ethical hierarchy, that defendant created in 2021 in this case, in regards to, trust expected from this human being, client.

Plaintiff believes, these previously undisclosed conflictions, more probably than not, duped defendant into choosing to deal with Plaintiff's refusal to deviate from contracted roles, with libelous and slanderous words, that Plaintiff believes are best left to the restricted exhibits provided, in the interest of public safety.

Plaintiff also alleges that since her agency with said client, existed years prior to Noah Pines' agency with said client, it must also be, that if Plaintiff has questions, and feels these are legitimate questions to ask Noah Pines, defendant, however misguided he may or may not have appeared, should be answering, whether the questions are asked by said client, or Plaintiff.

Furthermore, Plaintiff believes strongly, that she allowed Noah Pines to have a contract with her client until Plaintiff was forced to prove it was not ethical or moral, nor in the best interest of Plaintiff's client, for Plaintiff to continue to withhold the tools she has available to her as a licensed commoner, to uphold her duties, which Plaintiff feels are clear and to her client, rather than Noah Pines was "allowing" Plaintiff or extending Plaintiff any professional courtesies, not required of him, by law.

Plaintiff believes strongly, she is not out of her role, and therefore, not her agency's and license's requirements of ethics or morals, in the eyes of the law, either generally or specifically, in relation to the insurance industry, or any other industry governed by licensure, to expect professional courtesy for her licensure requirements to abide by the same code of conduct of all professions to be guided by the same societal ethics and morals standards, and that exhibition of said guidance and adherence to ethics and morals across industries, should be gauged by respectful and factual presentations of laws on our books as well as our "Common Sense."

Plaintiff is just a licensed commoner and not a licensed attorney. A product of good schools in Wisconsin, who Plaintiff believes are now struggling to be able to teach our kids the basics of "The Golden Rule" and fair play due to society's case of potential amnesia, that we are all held to be accountable for our own actions, as well as the value to human evolution that history holds as currently evidenced by certain states in our "Union" believing books are bad, in any arena and said proposed laws reflecting the "books are bad" mentality that permeated the halls of government in 1941 abroad and wreaked havoc on the world, are no more untenable today than they were seventy plus years ago.

Plaintiff contends as indisputable, as a commonly accepted principle of fact, that history has value to offer, from which humans, whether commoners or elite, can learn from.

Plaintiff further contends that, history has clearly not yet taught the masses or the few, the commoners or the elites, both here and abroad, that each human being, no matter how created, or by

whom, has value to offer, a pulse with which to gauge stress, a voice to cry for help, and an entitled expectation of rehabilitation as well as respect after rehabilitation, with which used, all these tools properly, when celebrated instead of demonized, recognized instead of ignored, amplified instead of muted, are the metl with which righteous and just causes are made both then and now. The same METL that our ancestors used at Gettysburg, when Abraham Lincoln directed all Americans and all future Americans, to not let the sacrifices made and endured at the hallowed ground be forgotten or needed again. That METL is still available to any anti-fascist soldier for Democracy and Plaintiff feels, Defendant, has more probably than not behaved in ways that require its employment again.

In that, Plaintiff humbly attempts to amplify perceived sentiments delivered by the Honorable, now passed, Ruth Bader-Ginsburg's voice, in quoting, "I think the notion that we have all the democracy that money can buy strays so far from what our democracy is supposed to be. I think members of our legislature, people who have run for office, know the connection between money and influence on what laws get passed."

Plaintiff expands here on the Hon. Ruth Bader-Ginsburg's perceived sentiment, to say, the old typing drill we all practiced on the now antiquated typewriters that invoke nostalgia for Plaintiff to this day, needs to evolve along with this country's Government, people, men, women, of all races, creeds, colors or religions, and we need to be teaching the following instead, "It is time for all good WOMEN, to come to the aid of their country."

Plaintiff alleges, Mothers and women, have been instrumental in the progression of human evolution and our society, Plaintiff believes, is potentially wrought with barbarism and fascism today, "BULLIES", where there should only be, compassion for all equally, voices heard instead of muted. Plaintiff asks this court, where will we be if we start punishing our Mothers, our daughters, sisters, and grandmothers, in the face of misogyny, and fascism, barbarism, and all other demonizing forms of

Government and JAILING THEM in those names, Are we still the Great Democratic Experiment, who's leading by example?

Plaintiff also alleges, the current stress levels viewed as well as felt, by this commoner, have and are manifesting, on television, social media and in all estates of our Federal Government, including but not limited to the fourth estate, representing the current state of affairs for commoners, are intolerable and too burdensome.

Police Officers are both expected to protect and serve while vigilantly prosecuting offenders. These two tasks, Plaintiff believes, are in direct opposition to each other and are rarely seen as adversarial in the planning of and doling out of resources, specifically when resources are delegated, due to the lack of mental health initial screening and routine periodic mental health screenings, not triggered by adverse interactions with the public.

Plaintiff contends, as she learned in the military in 1987, not to expect team members, or soldiers of Justice, to accomplish missions, without the necessary tools, whether here at home, or abroad.

When trusted licenses, gavels and guns, appear to be held by potentially bad actors, or potentially deluded with power officers, the commoner, whether licensed or not, may be left with inadequate resources to address valid situations of ethics and morals, with the urgency that is hopefully, rarely needed, to aid our potentially overburdened judicial branch, to prevent ill-advised resolutions to basic challenges, that should be handled with civility. Plaintiff also alleges, a lack of oversight to said authorities, whether such authorities employ the use of guns, gavels or licenses, should never fail to heed oversight from the very commoners that still need to appear to be employers of said authorities.

Plaintiff now proclaims she believes, without a law license, that the Civil Justice System in this country must maintain a parental relationship to the Criminal Justice System in these United States,

unless all be lost in this great Democratic Experiment, for a justice system that lacks civility, certainly cannot maintain order, and without civility, the commoner is left with only barbarism and fascism with which to not only survive, but also to accept an image of an environment capable of producing dream-like results, showing cartoons to entire generations with which to teach children.

Plaintiff cites, anti-bullying programs in our primary and secondary education systems, funded by PTA's, PTO's and other civic minded organizations, as evidence that schools at the most basic and elementary levels, have been robbed, and are being robbed of the tools necessary to provide our children, our later adults, these same basic rules of civility, as well as a basic education necessary, to survive expectations of being a law-abiding citizen as an adult, much less thrive, Plaintiff feels.

Plaintiff further contends, it is this unequal application of resources at the Federal Level, and thereby hindering the States' abilities to adequately distribute these resources, as a possible key failure.

Respectfully, Plaintiff does contend, that all persons in roles comprising the many facets of the Federal Government, have individual pursuits that do not always run parallel to the goals of the Federal Government. Plaintiff recognizes this is an ill-addressed challenge to the Federal Government's mandates. Plaintiff is not a legislator, however is a strong believer in the necessity to maintain her connection to the legislative branch of government through her elected representatives, to gauge the results of the historical mandates of Government, both State and Federal, perceived by Plaintiff in regards to the expectations of commoners to equally experience the "American Dream."

The idiom, "Money is the root of all evil" has never been more apparent than in our current elected staff in our House of Representatives, and the lack of accountability that has been witnessed by commoners to reconcile the "staff" of January 6, 2021, and the current staff of Congress.

Plaintiff here now declares, she commends and amplifies the sentiments of the Hon. Ruth Bader- Ginsburg, God rest her soul, who declared, the 2010 Citizens United decision, could be the worst decision of that session of the Supreme Court. Plaintiff does not declare Citizen's United the worst decision of that session of the Supreme Court to debate, but simply to express Plaintiff's displeasure with what the court's decision left for the masses.

Plaintiff feels her current court cases may not have been required, had that decision not granted already well endowed elites, rights previously enjoyed by only commoners. Plaintiff also understands, she may not have needed to spend the last almost 8 years litigating a blatantly fraudulent mortgage, in an unfair fight against the behemoth Bank, known as Wells Fargo, in her own unfamiliar state court, if US Attorneys had chosen to recognize the blatancy with which these behemoth powerhouses choose to attack commoners in community property states, signifying to all commoners, there is no help to be secured from the US Attorneys that have been granted a title resembling "Watchdog of Democracy", here or abroad which has already pained in numerous ways, Plaintiff's ability to expect any success in her daily pursuits of life liberty and happiness.


Plaintiff understands, this decision more probably than not, granted an excessive amount of power to already powerful people, brought by already powerful people and entities the ability to compound their already unequal power against the commoner in regards to wealth, with the power of industry and business to wield against the commoner, compounding the challenges to, and of the commoner who are many, for the few who are already unevenly armed, against the many. Plaintiff strongly feels that aforementioned decision appears to be a decision where the principles of collective bargaining have been incorrectly applied to commoners' as well as elites' voting rights. Plaintiff picked up an automatic weapon and donned a US Uniform to ensure these United States strictly adhere to the principle of one person one vote, and does not feel this decision by our seemingly unbridled court of today, should be considered tenable or just, in the face of principles of collective bargaining incorrectly

applied to voting rights and believes collective bargaining principles are better left to the private sector and not our Constitution-given voting rights.

For all these highlighted reasons, including but not limited to morals, ethics, civility, due process, and all we should still hold dear in these United States in this twilight or dawn of today, Plaintiff perceives darkness and light simultaneously in the ask posed to this court, will it be a bridge over troubled valleys, or will the esteemed courts decision be further devolution into said valleys? or Will it be a bridge from one precipice to another, with the other precipice, being a resemblance of a picture perceived by many before Plaintiff, as the positive manifestation of the coming of her Lord, who guides Lady Justice's appendages through struggles and triumphs. Let it be triumph for a more even tally of wins and historic losses felt most intimately by the common masses. Plaintiff reiterates her request for a Federal Grand Jury for both, herself and defendant, and equal scrutiny at that esteemed destination and court. Plaintiff contends the content of the restricted exhibits and the undisclosed facts and truths, plaintiff recognizes in reference, the difference between the two contained, cannot be disclosed in the interest of public safety and order.

Plaintiff also recognizes that these United States, were founded on basic principles cleverly illustrated to and broadcast across televisions far and wide, a program called SchoolHouse Rock, ™, and cites, "No More Kings," as well as "sufferin until suffrage," perceived as deeply relevant to this case and current society, and her own situation, dropped at the Plaintiff's Wisconsin doorstep by the accused, without any regard for Plaintiff's own licensure and human experience prior to that point in history. Plaintiff reiterates her claim for Federal Whistleblower's Act protections, as well as Federal Witness Protection for herself, her client, and all unnamed members of this defense team that Plaintiff feels, NOAH Pines, has never been a part of arguably.

Lisa Jacobson, Wisconsin Resident, Licensed Insurance Agent

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Lisa L. Jacobson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large, prominent "L" and "J".